

Equal Rights

VOL. XVI, No. 11
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY,
APRIL 19, 1930
APR 18
1930
RECEIVED
CONGRESS



Harria-Ewing.

Chairman of Woman's Party Telephones The Hague

In order to check up on events as they were transpiring at The Hague during the World Conference on Codification of International Law, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, Chairman of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, telephoned to Doris Stevens who, as Chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, was working for the adoption of the Equal Nationality Convention. From left to right: Anita Pollitzer of South Carolina, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, Alice Paul, and Elsie Hill of Connecticut.

Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
144 B St. N. E.
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Lincoln 1366
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker Editor
Ruby A. Black Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender	Ada Davenport Kendall
Zoe Beckley	Katherine Leckie
Ruby A. Black	Hazel MacKaye
Elaine Sterne Carrington	Edna St. Vincent Millay
Lucia Chamberlain	Ruth Pickering
Phyllis Duganne	Alice Rohe
Ernestine Evans	Maryse Rutledge
Rose Feld	Miriam Finn Scott
Zona Gale	Doris Stevens
Helen Davenport Gibbons	Sophie Treadwell
Rebecca Hourwich	Brenda Ueland
Ruth Hale	Mary Winsor
Inez Haynes Irwin	

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 a Year

Foreign Subscription, \$2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

President, Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Chairman National Council, Mrs. Harvey Wiley, D. C.
Vice-Chairmen,
Gall Laughlin, Me.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, A. Marguerite Smith, N. Y.
Executive Secretary, Mabel Vernon, Del.
Treasurer, Emma Wold, Ore.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Legislative Secretary, Emma Wold, Ore.
Parliamentarian, Emma Fox, Mich.
Edith Alnge, N. Y.
Anne Archbold, Me.
Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Laura Berrien, D. C.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.
Elsie Hill, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Ruth Vandeer Litt, N. Y.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Sarah Pell, N. Y.
Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mabel Vernon, Del.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues.....	\$10.00
Associate Members.....	\$1.00
Subscribing Members.....	\$3.00
Founders	\$100.00
Life Members.....	\$1,000.00
Endowers	\$5,000.00
Sustainers	\$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 52]
[House Joint Resolution No. 55]

Introduced in the Senate June 4, 1929,
by SENATOR GERALD P. NYE, North Dakota.

Introduced in the House April 25, 1929,
by REPRESENTATIVE FREDERICK W. MAGRADY
Pennsylvania.

An Inevitable Corollary

IF ANYTHING were needed to spur the women of our country on to redoubled efforts to secure their full rights and obligations as citizens, the action of the United States delegation to The Hague Conference on Codification of International Law would fill the requirement. There is something magnificent, something quite altogether overwhelming, in belonging to the only country on the planet that dared to stand up among the nations at The Hague and demand equal nationality rights for men and women.

We are proud of President Hoover; we are proud of the United States delegation, but most of all we are proud that mankind has at last developed a sense of justice sufficient to triumph over sex prejudice. And we wish to belong, we are determined to belong, as full citizens to the country that gave this stupendous demonstration.

The United States has now put her hand to the plow and cannot look back. The obvious, the only dignified thing, for this country to do now is immediately to make the nationality rights for her men and women citizens identical. She cannot do otherwise without being grossly misunderstood by her sister nations.

Moreover, the same public opinion that enabled the United States to refuse to accept at The Hague the convention which embodied discriminations against the citizenship of women requires that the citizenship of American men and women shall be placed upon the same footing. An equal nationality law in the United States of America is an inevitable corollary to the action taken by the United States delegation at The Hague Conference.

Further, the United States cannot without hopelessly compromising her dignity participate in any future Conferences on Codification of International Law until Article 1 has been completely revised on a basis of equality. We have refused to accept Article 1 on the ground that it contains unjust discriminations against women. The discriminations still stand. To participate in future conferences until these injustices have been removed would be to connive at them.

Let the United States await a change in heart on the part of the other nations. When they have developed a sense of justice commensurate with the problems with which they presume to deal, it will be time enough to confer with them.

Meanwhile may the Congress of the United States put its own house in a little better order by equalizing the nationality rights of its own constituents.

Women Win With Mrs. McCormick

IN ORDER fully to evaluate the significance of what happened in the Illinois Republican primary, when Ruth Hanna McCormick won out over Senator Deneen by a margin of some two hundred thousand votes, it is essential to call to mind the attitude of large sections of the public toward "lady" politicians. Even after the last Presidential election the archaic sentiment still survives that women are not to be taken seriously in politics.

This viewpoint and the chagrin which it has suffered in Mrs. McCormick's election in the primary is beautifully evidenced in the following excerpts from an editorial in the Baltimore Sun of April 10:

"The victory of Mrs. Ruth Hanna McCormick in the Illinois Republican primary on Tuesday will seem to many to set the sovereign State of Illinois neatly on a leaf of lettuce, covered with a dash of mayonnaise and garnished with a cherry. The mere threat of a lady Senator should account for many a groan of '*Actum est de republica*,' or 'America is done for!' Even though such suspirations of grief arise from mere sex prejudice, there is ample emotional precedent for the idea that the toga falls awkwardly from feminine shoulders—*vide* lady lodge meetings." * * *

The amused contempt, the complacent assumption of masculine superiority, in short the sublime arrogance of the ultra-male, he-man, breathes through every line of this editorial. But the he-man's confidence is visibly shaken. He is still smiling, but something after the nature of vinegar has affected his risibles. Clearly he is afraid that soon he may have to take off his smile and throw it into the discard.

Mrs. McCormick's victory is not only a personal triumph and a vindication of the truth that in the end right will prevail, but it is also, and primarily, a Feminist victory. The practical proof that Mrs. McCormick has given that women can succeed in the political arena has done more to take sex out of politics than anything else that has happened since the winning of the suffrage.

United States Refuses to Accept Unequal Code

By Ruby A. Black

THE United States delegates to the International Conference on the Codification of International Law refused to vote for the nationality code containing discriminations against women. The code was adopted by the conference at The Hague on April 10 by a vote of 40 to 1, the United States standing alone in opposing this unequal code.

Every effort was made by the Inter-American Commission of Women and by Feminists in the United States to have the conference postpone consideration of the nationality question, as it had already postponed consideration of the other two questions before the conference, territorial waters and responsibilities for damages to foreigners. American women urged that the United States withdraw from the conference if the nationality code was not postponed.

Before the voting began on April 10 David Hunter Miller, head of the United States delegation and editor of treaties for the Department of State, issued a statement, saying he was unable to sign the convention.

The United States Government, said Mr. Miller, appreciated the value and helpfulness of the discussions at the conference, the present and future importance of which could hardly be overstated. The convention contained clauses to which the United States had no objection, but also a number of features the Americans were unable to accept.

The acceptance of the convention as a whole would, therefore, involve such extensive reservations, Mr. Miller concluded, that his Government held it would be better to await a further and more progressive agreement. The discussion at the present conference would doubtless facilitate this.

His statement was applauded by the Feminists attending the conference.

After the vote Doris Stevens, chairman of the Inter-American Commission of Women, said that the chief accomplishment of the conference had been a convention "which outraged the dignity and the integrity of women the world over."

"Instead of lifting the hearts and heads of women with encouragement and inviting their support," she said, "the conference repeated the errors of centuries, putting women to one side in an unfair and isolated position."

After Mr. Miller had announced the United States delegation would not sign the general nationality convention, he added that the delegation had also recommended this convention should not be signed at a later date. This, however, was a question for the American Government to decide.

Alice Paul, chairman of the Nationality

Committee of the Inter-American Commission of Women, which has been waging a determined fight in Washington and at The Hague, said in a statement issued in Washington:

"We rejoice that our Government has taken this emphatic stand against any World Law based on inequality between men and women. We are proud that our nation stood up alone in an international conference and refused to enter into an international code of law because it contained distinctions based on sex. We are proud that our nation is not participating in any way in the launching of such a code.

"While we regret that in spite of the stand of the United States for equality, the Old World standard prevailed in the conference and that the World Code was launched on a basis of inequality, we hope and believe that the protest which the United States has registered will cause the whole question to be reopened. This question was settled right in this conference so far as our own country was concerned, but it will never be settled finally until it is settled right for the whole world."

WOMEN'S organizations from all over the world protested against the nationality convention because it is founded upon the principle of sex inequality.

Mrs. Manuel de Oliveira Lima, Brazilian Commissioner on the Inter-American Commission of Women, sent a cable to Minister Leao Velloso at Rio de Janeiro, asking him to join the United States in refusing to sign the nationality convention, because it contains discriminations against women.

The nationality convention which was adopted by The Hague Conference on the Codification of International Laws is the first article of a projected World Code of Law. It consists of seventeen sections and more than half of these sections discriminate against women, either directly or by implication.

Representative John L. Cable of Ohio, who is working for equalization of the nationality laws of the United States, has introduced a resolution calling for an international conference on nationality alone, and before the vote was taken at The Hague he introduced a resolution expressing the will of Congress that the American delegates to the conference should not be a party to any articles that would constitute a backward step and should adhere to the principle that a woman should enjoy the same nationality rights as a man.

NINETY minutes before the final vote on nationality was taken at The Hague two delegations, one representing the National Association of Women Lawyers, headed by Mrs. J. Garfield Riley, dean of the Washington College of Law, and another headed by Maud Younger, Congressional chairman of the National Woman's Party, interviewed President Hoover. They asked him to telephone the United States delegation to threaten withdrawal from the Conference on the Codification of International Law unless the conference agreed to postpone the whole subject of nationality.

In the interview Miss Younger said:

"The conference has already voted to postpone the other two subjects relating to territorial waters and damages to foreigners because there is disagreement among the delegates. Why not postpone decision on the subject of nationality? The women of the whole world are against unequal nationality rights. The United States delegation has objected to the discriminatory clauses. Why not go a step further and postpone the whole subject until the nations of the world have had a chance to study the principle 'that in their law and practice relating to nationality there shall be no distinction based on sex?'"

"Delegates from many of the other countries would be willing to follow if the United States would lead in demanding postponement of the nationality convention. Already Uruguay and Cuba have instructed their delegates to move the postponement of this question. If you telephone Mr. Miller, chief of the United States delegation, to act at once, there will still be time for you to save American women from the injustice which would follow the launching of a world code at their expense."

Before the Feminists saw the President, Dr. James Brown Scott, president of the American Institute of International Law, and Representative Cable interviewed the President on the same subject. They also asked withdrawal of the United States delegates if the conference did not agree to postponement of the nationality convention.

Dr. Scott pointed out to the President that the nationality clauses already adopted in committee discriminate against women.

"If the conventions on territorial waters and responsibility to foreigners can be referred back to the governments for discussion," he said, "surely all three subjects can be resubmitted. The very fact that the conference does not want to postpone action on the nationality convention shows that they know these sections discriminate against women."

Representative Cable then told the President that in this crisis he was the only one who had the power to act decisively in the matter. Representative Cable asked him to urge that the whole question of nationality be referred back to the governments who, after study of the subject, could resubmit the matter to the conference. He asked the President to further instruct the United States delegates to withdraw from the conference if the conference did not postpone the question of nationality as they had already agreed to do on the other questions before it.

FOLLOWING their interview, Dr. Scott and Representative Cable were requested by President Hoover to see Acting Secretary of State Joseph Cotton. They requested Mr. Cotton to instruct the American delegates to move to postpone the consideration of the proposed nationality convention for further study of the question and to submit anew the question of nationality along with territorial waters and responsibility to foreigners to a future conference of the nations at The Hague.

Mr. Cotton promised to give his immediate attention to the matter, as any instructions which he would decide to send would have to go within half an hour. Without committing himself in the matter of instructions he informed Representative Cable and Dr. Scott that the request was reasonable.

While the Feminists were at the White House waiting to see the President they saw Acting Secretary of State Cotton, who at that time was still of the opinion that the United States delegation was doing all it could on behalf of the women and that the United States would not sign a discriminatory treaty.

In her speech to Mr. Cotton Mrs. Riley pointed out that the nationality committee at The Hague had already voted for articles 9, 10, 11 and 12, which deal with the nationality of married women and contain distinctions based on sex. The United States delegates, she said, had voted for two of these articles.

Helen Jamison declared that human rights were at stake at The Hague, and if such relatively unimportant matters as territorial waters and responsibility to foreigners could be postponed, the question of nationality rights should certainly be deferred until the world is ready to adopt an Equal Rights nationality principle.

Laura Berrien, chairman of the international relations committee of the American Association of Women Lawyers, and Mabel Hiatt also urged that the United States delegates stand for postponement or withdrawal.

A DELEGATION of Republican women from New York State called on President Hoover on April 9 to ask him to withdraw the United States delegates at The Hague unless the conference agreed to postpone the convention on nationality.

The delegates included Jane Norman Smith, Elizabeth Selden Rogers, Mrs. George F. Laidlaw, and Mrs. Lloyd Williams of New York City, together with Edith Ainge and Jessie Ainge of Jamestown, Mrs. P. J. Simmens of Eden, and May C. Sickmon of Buffalo.

In her speech Mrs. Smith said:

"All of us here are Republicans from New York City and up-State New York. I worked in the campaign for your election speaking both indoors and on the street corners in your behalf. I feel that you would be interested in hearing our viewpoint on the question of the nationality treaty which is now before The Hague Conference. We have come to you because, as President of the United States, you are in a most powerful position. Women of the entire world are in peril in case the League of Nations draft on the nationality of women be passed by the Conference on the Codification of International Law now in session at The Hague. Cables which we have received indicate that there is every likelihood of the passage of a code on nationality which will provide one law for men and another for women. The women are united in their opposition to such a code. There is need for immediate action.

"We ask that you instruct the United States plenipotentiaries to get up on the floor of the conference and demand a postponement of the question of nationality. This has already been done by the conference on the sections relating to territorial waters. Since we have gone on for three or four thousand years without any international code, surely three weeks is too short a time—especially when there is so great disagreement between the plenipotentiaries of the various countries—to launch a world code on nationality. The subject requires further study. If the conference refuses postponement, we ask for the withdrawal of our delegates."

Mrs. Roger declared that it was not enough for the United States delegation to vote against the sections which discriminate against women on the subject of nationality.

"The United States is powerful enough to enforce its position on this matter," she said. "And if Mr. Miller, head of the delegation, threatens withdrawal, I am quite certain the conference will immediately agree to postpone the question of nationality until a later conference. In the meantime the various governments will have an opportunity to study the

Equal Rights Treaty, as the United States delegation has already suggested."

Miss Sickmon informed the President that the women of the United States are united in endorsing equal nationality rights for men and women.

The President expressed himself as being entirely in sympathy with the petition of the women, and said he would consider their request as to tactics.

A DELEGATION of New York women also interviewed Acting Secretary of State Cotton. Spokesmen for this group were Jane Norman Smith, Elizabeth Selden Rogers, and Nina Broderick Price, who declared that the women of the entire world were up in arms against the launching of the world code on a basis of inequality between men and women.

Mrs. Rogers said:

"We are asking you two things only. First: We ask you on behalf of our Government to instruct the United States delegates at The Hague to insist that the conference postpone the whole question of nationality in the proposed world code until the nations of the world are ready to adopt a code based on equality between men and women. Second: To instruct the United States delegates to walk out of the conference, if the conference will not agree to postpone action on this question. We do not want the women of the world to fight for their nationality rights as we had to fight for suffrage, State by State. We want to launch the world code on an Equal Rights basis. The United States has the power to put this over and the women will not be satisfied until you do it."

Mr. Cotton said that according to his advices from the United States delegation no treaty at all was likely to be drawn up by the conference. Mrs. Smith showed him a copy of a cable from the Chilean delegate, Miguel Cruchaga, who introduced the Equal Rights Treaty endorsed by the women, which stated that the conference would pass the nationality sections with clauses discriminating against women. Mrs. Smith told him that other cables from The Hague indicated the same thing and that unless the United States took a decided stand and backed up the demands of the women, the world code would be launched on an inequality basis between men and women.

Mrs. Price, president of the New York Zonta Club, who represented the international organization of the Zonta Club, declared that the women of other countries where the men do not have the same advanced ideas about the rights of women as American men have were begging that the United States use its tremendous power on their behalf as well as on behalf of the American women. Mrs. Price quoted interviews she had with various

European Feminists this past year in which they all endorsed the Equal Rights Treaty and asked the American women to help them get it.

Among the women in the delegation were: Mrs. George F. Laidlaw, New York City; Mrs. Lloyd Williams, New York City; Edith Ainge, Jamestown; Mrs. P. J. Simmens, Eden; Jessie Ainge, New York City; Edith B. Newman, New York City; Mary Owen, New York City; Flora B. Daniels, Auburn; and Martha Ward, Elmira.

IN a determined effort to defeat the nationality clauses discriminating against women, the Inter-American Commission of Women lined up the United States Senate to oppose ratification of the World Code.

They enlisted fifteen Senators, headed by Senator Borah, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in their campaign before the vote was taken. Seven more Senators: Johnson of California, Pittman of Nevada, George of Georgia, Wheeler of Montana, Shipstead of Minnesota, Connally of Texas, and Shortridge of California, joined Fess of Ohio, Capper of Kansas, Heflin of Alabama, Caraway of Arkansas, Bratton of New Mexico, Stephens of Mississippi, and Sheppard of Texas in opposing the inclusion of any clause discriminating against women in the nationality.

Senator Borah said in a statement

given to the press: "I will not support any part of the proposed world code which contains any distinctions based on sex in regard to nationality."

Senator Johnson said: "I am quite in accord with Senator Borah and I would not agree to any code wherein there were discriminations based on sex."

Senator Pittman said: "In reply to your request as to whether in my opinion the Senate of the United States would ratify an international code that violated the American concept of Women's national, political, and commercial rights to independence, I unhesitatingly reply that I do not believe that such a code would be ratified."

Similar statements were issued by Senators Wheeler, Connally, Shipstead, George, and Shortridge who declared that they would oppose ratification by the Senate, if any discriminatory clauses were included.

Senator Fess said: "I would hesitate to vote for the ratification of a world code which contains discriminations based on sex. If the conference is not ready to stand for equality between men and women in matters of nationality, the only wise course for the United States delegation, in my judgment, is to stand for the postponement of all action on nationality until more consideration can be given to the matter by the various governments of the world."

Senator Capper of Kansas, gave out the

following statement: "I am opposed to the ratification by the Senate of any world code of law which contains any discrimination based on sex. The United States delegation at The Hague should have nothing to do with a code of this kind."

Senator Heflin of Alabama said: "If the world code now being negotiated at The Hague does not recognize the principle of equal nationality rights for men and women I feel confident that it will not be ratified by the United States Senate."

Senator Caraway of Arkansas said: "As one Senator I feel that the world code now being launched at the Hague will not be ratified by the United States Senate if there are any discriminations based on sex."

Senator Bratton of New Mexico in his statement declared: "I disapprove of any discriminations against women on account of sex and will not vote for any treaty or covenant negotiated at The Hague that contained distinctions based on sex."

Senator Sheppard of Texas said: "I will not vote to ratify any nationality convention negotiated at The Hague which contains any discriminations based on sex."

Senator Stephens of Mississippi declared: "In my opinion inclusion of discrimination against women in proposed world code will jeopardize adoption of code by United States."

New York Defeats "Welfare" Bills

ON March 18, at a hearing held before the Committees on Labor and Industries of the New York Senate and Assembly, the Woman's Party, Women's Press Club, Zonta Club of New York City, New York City Federation of Business and Professional Women, the Business and Professional Women's Club of Brooklyn, the Conference Club and Legislative League of New York City, and individual industrial workers were ranged solidly against the State Federation of Labor, the State Labor Department, League of Women Voters, Consumers' League and Women's Trade Union League on 48-hour week and minimum wage legislation for women.

There were four 48-hour week bills for women before the committees — the Kennedy-Kahan, Higgins, Gates-Miller and Mastick bills.

Governor Roosevelt had asked for "a straight 48-hour law for women and children." The Kennedy-Hahn and Higgins bills, both Democratic measures, came nearest to the Governor's demand. Although they provided for an 8-hour day and 48-hour week in factories and mercantile establishments, there were exceptions making it possible for women in factories to be employed ten hours in any

one day in order to make a shorter work day or holiday on one day, and women in mercantile establishments to be employed more than eight hours on one day in order to make one or more shorter work days in the week.

The Gates-Miller bill was introduced by the chairmen of the Committees on Labor and Industries. Both are Republicans. It provided for an 8-hour day for women, with many exceptions which could add to the length of a day and week.

The Mastick bill was introduced by a Republican. It provides that no female over sixteen shall be employed in a factory for more than six days, eight hours in any one day or 48 hours in any week, except that she may be employed five days of the week at not to exceed nine hours on each day and not more than four and one-half hours on a shorter work-day and not over 49½ hours a week. It further provides that if during the entire year no female employee in a factory is employed in each week for more than five days or five days and a shorter work-day of not more than four and one-half hours, she may be employed overtime for not to exceed a total of 78 hours in such year. In the distribution of such overtime, she may not work more than 10 hours a day

nor more than five days plus four and one-half hours on any sixth day, nor more than 54 hours in any week. No overtime work is allowed except during two periods in each calendar year, each of such periods to consist of "no more than 61 consecutive calendar days." Within two weeks prior to the commencement of each overtime period, the employer shall file a proposed overtime schedule, in duplicate, with the State Industrial Commissioner, and such overtime shall not begin until one of the duplicates shall have been returned with the approval of the Commissioner stamped upon it. The filing of each overtime schedule shall constitute an election of one of the permitted overtime periods, and, if approved, no substitution of another period shall be permitted even though no female has been employed within the elected period or any part thereof.

When one recalls the pleas of Labor Departments and welfare groups against allowing women to work longer than eight hours in any one day, because of their "health and need of rest and recreation," it is difficult to reconcile their expressed convictions with exactly opposite legislation to which they agree. Again and again they have said that accidents occur

especially during the fatiguing end of a long day — "the last hour" when more than eight. This may be true. In any case, it would apply to men too. Yet here are the protectionists saying that they will agree to have women work nine and ten hours a day and 49½ and 54 hours a week!

ANN HARBOTTLE WHITTIC, chairman for New York State; Jane Norman Smith, Mary Murray and Jeannette Cortez, representing the Woman's Party, opposed all four bills on the ground that they discriminated against women. They asked for their amendment to apply to both sexes or else for their defeat. Mrs. Whittic and Mrs. Smith stated the Woman's Party position against labor legislation applying to women only. They, with Mrs. Murray, pointed out that women are an established and increasingly important part of our economic life and that justice demands that legislation concerning them shall be on the same basis as that for their male competitors; that the demand for a shorter work day is based upon the need of leisure, health and recreation; that these needs bear no relation to sex, and the laws which provide for a shorter work day should be made regardless of sex. They declared that proposed legislation applying to women workers sponsored by labor groups in New York, California, Massachusetts and other States, proves the contention of the Woman's Party that this legislation is being advanced as an opening wedge through which all wage-earning women may be brought under the rigid restrictions of regulatory laws.

Mrs. Cortez, an employee of a chain of restaurants, said that the existing 48-hour law for women affects women restaurant employees who sell candy and bakery products over the counter; that any more restrictions of overtime would further handicap women.

Mrs. Bessie Allen, a candy factory worker, said: "I represent 300 girls in the factory. I know these girls are opposed to a 48-hour law. Our work is seasonal and the girls would like to work overtime in the winter to make up for the lay-off in the summer. They cannot do this with a 48-hour week law."

Miss May Jensen, from the same candy factory, said: "I am head checker and forelady and am in competition with three men for a higher executive position. Owing to the fact that I cannot work the hours that these men can work, I am disqualified for the position for that reason only. Also, I have come in contact with as many as 600 women who oppose a 48-hour week law for women. They cannot understand why it is being imposed upon them."

Frances C. Ford, a social worker, and director of Zonta Club of New York City,

spoke for her organization: "Why special labor laws for women? We contend that if there are to be regulations and restrictions, they should be based not upon sex but upon the nature of the occupation, and should apply to all workers. If industrial conditions are bad, the only satisfactory solution is to remedy them so that they will be suitable for the average worker. Restrictive legislation applying only to women is economically bad. It deprives us of a right to make a place for ourselves in the economic world. Why try to take away from us our inherent right? Why not let us prove that we are capable and trustworthy to handle really big jobs? A real executive job in a mercantile establishment can only be gained by slow progress up the ladder. Stock taking can only be done after hours, and this must of necessity be done fairly frequently. If the hours of labor are so limited that women employees cannot work after hours, what is the result? Of course women will be replaced by men. The demand for a shorter work-day are based on needs that have no relation to sex. At the present time I have in my acquaintance a number of men who have broken down at 40 and 50. They are keen men but have overworked. If women need legislation, surely many men do too. Why not make your laws apply to your own sex and compel men to conserve their energy so they will not break down when their earning power is at its peak? Why pick on us women? We are wise enough to safeguard our own health. We object to being linked with children. Identical legislation for children and women prevents children from getting needed protection and handicaps adult women. We only ask for the opportunities which should be ours—to make a place for ourselves in the labor field where our earning power will not be limited and we will not be handicapped in earning an honest living. I am the only woman executive in an international organization. If my hours had been restricted during the time I was trying to attain a higher position, what chance would I have had? We register our deep opposition to the special labor bills for women before this committee."

MRS. IDA SLACK, representing the Women's Press Club and the Legislative League of New York City, said she had been commissioned, on behalf of these organizations, to oppose the four 48-hour week and the minimum wage bills for women, and to ask that the restrictions "protecting" women in industrial employment be taken out of the law. "In asking for 'protection' for women, the same arguments are being used as were advanced when women asked for a college education, to enter the professions and the right to vote. In placing these restric-

tions upon women, you are legislating them out of their jobs."

Mrs. Lois Pierce Hughes, speaking for the New York City Federation of Business and Professional Women and the Conference Club of New York City, said: "The organizations for which I appear are unalterably opposed to legislation which discriminates against women. We have found that the existing 48-hour law for women is mitigating against our promotion and handicapping us in selling our services. We do not want the positions of men but we ask for the same freedom of opportunity enjoyed by men to secure for ourselves a place in the sun."

MRS. BEATRICE STEVENSON, a member of the Kings County Republican Committee and the State Nurses' Association, reminded the Republican members of the committee that their party platform a few years ago had contained a plank in favor of industrial equality for women. "These so-called 'protective' measures," she said, "are made for the benefit of men, not for the benefit of women."

Mr. George A. Field, president of the Hamilton Bank Note Company, said that restrictions on women's working hours in the present law had made it necessary for his firm to replace many women by men and boys, much against its wishes, because of the necessity to work overtime, often on short notice. He said the women employees did not favor these restrictions.

Mark A. Daly, of the Associated Industries, spoke in favor of the Gates-Miller bill.

John M. O'Hanlon, secretary of the State Federation of Labor; Miss Frances Perkins, State Industrial Commissioner; Miss Frieda Miller, Chief of the Bureau of Women in Industry of the State Labor Department; Mrs. Florence Kelley, of the Consumers' League; Miss Mabel Leslie, of the Women's Trade Union League; Mrs. Bessie Hawley, of the State Federation of Labor; and Mrs. Irene Osgood Andrews, of the League of Women Voters; spoke in favor of the Mastick bill.

Miss Perkins declared that the 48-hour law now in effect is unenforceable and outlined the overtime provisions of the Mastick bill. Mr. Field, of the Hamilton Bank Note Company, in rebuttal took exception to Miss Perkins' claim that the division of overtime as provided in the Mastick bill was workable. Mr. Field said that a large number of employers would have no idea as to when their overtime work would begin or end; that much of his firm's business was transacted with attorneys and that it was necessary, on the shortest notice, to get our work immediately.

Miss Miller, evidently having only the Mastick bill in mind and forgetting that there were three other 48-hour bills before

the committee, said that the business women who were speaking against the legislation had no immediate interest in it because the regulation did not extend to executive and professional positions for which they might speak. The rebuttal brought out the fact that the existing 48-hour law, as well as most of the bills under discussion applied to women in mercantile establishments as well as factory workers.

Mrs. Andrews, for the League of Women Voters, said: "It is impossible to have equality between unequals!"

A necktie factory worker, a union woman, said that she did not work as many as 48 hours and that overtime could be eliminated if employers would plan their production ahead of time. In rebuttal, she was reminded that under union agreement she was not denied the right to work overtime as were two men members of the Railroad Brotherhoods, who had spoken in favor of the bill; that

they would not accept a law for themselves which did not give them the right to overtime work, with the pay that goes with it. Mrs. Allen, in rebuttal, said that, unfortunately, all employers do not manufacture neckties; that if her employers made candy months ahead of time, the necktie workers would not eat it.

Mrs. Hawley stated that some women workers on the B. M. T. Railroad were not in favor of the exemption which permits them to work on a night shift. Mrs. Murray said she had not met any and called upon eight women railroad workers in turn to tell the number of years they had been working on a night shift through preference.

The Woman's Party and the same groups opposing the 48-hour legislation asked for the amendment of the various minimum wage bills to apply to both sexes or for their defeat. They pointed out that when the State undertakes to regulate the wages of women without at the

same time regulating the wages of men, women invariably lose their jobs and are replaced by men and boys of sixteen or over, as was proved in the recent discharge of scrubwomen by Harvard University. Mrs. Smith read the article which appeared in the March issue of the official organ of the Women's Trade Union League in criticism of minimum wage legislation. Mrs. Slack quoted the United States Supreme Court decision against the Minimum Wage Law for Women in the District of Columbia in 1923.

Mrs. Andrews spoke on behalf of her own and other organizations for the Mastick bill to give power to the Bureau of Women in Industry to investigate the wages of women and minors in industry, and to try to make an equitable adjustment of wages between the employers and employee.

With the exception of one bill to amend the existing law, all of the bills were killed in committee.

"Women Pioneers"

A Review by Dorothea J. Lewis of a Book by Jane Y. McCallum, Johnson Publishing Company

SO THAT American boys and girls may know, admire, and boast of their "foremothers" who pioneered and achieved, as well as of their forefathers, Jane Y. McCallum has written "Women Pioneers."

Intended primarily for boys and girls of high school age, the book is simply told, straightforward and extremely interesting. Its array of women who succeeded and excelled in business, politics and religion from the very landing of the Pilgrims when women "could listen and learn but not speak" to this day of at least partial equality are astonishing. Many of them will probably be as unfamiliar to adults as to school children. This is an unfortunate condition that only more books like Mrs. McCallum's can remedy.

It is hard to understand just why those who chronicled the early history of our country could become as enthusiastic as they did over the fathers of the nation and entirely neglect women such as Anne Hutchinson, Margaret Brent, Mary Dyer and all the rest. Perhaps our historians' attitude toward these early Feminists—and they were true Feminists with surprisingly modern ideas as to their rights—was similar to that of one of the Mayflower's masculine voyageurs, quoted by Mrs. McCallum, who wrote, "The people have gone ashore for recreation and the women to wash the clothes."

And now, in this year of 1930, in our own free continent Canadian women have just, by a special act of the English Privy Council, overthrown this differentiation between women and "people" made in 1607, and are at last acknowledged as persons.

Most of the women about whom Mrs. McCallum writes are not well known. Dolly Madison is perhaps the most familiar of the fourteen discussed, and much of her widespread fame can be credited to her wit and beauty rather than her pioneering devotion to her country in the dangerous years of 1812, 1813 and 1814. Clara Barton, creator of the American Red Cross; Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, valiant campaigners for woman suffrage; Frances E. Willard, the great temperance crusader, and Anna Howard Shaw, a trail-blazer for women in religion, are more modern and recognizable than the others.

The achievements of these fourteen women were too unlike and too widely separated by time and space to attempt any continuity in the telling of their stories. So Mrs. McCallum has wisely told each story as a separate and complete entity, yet one closes the book with the feeling of having read only one story, that of woman's long and terribly uphill fight to be a person in a man-ruled world.

Margaret Brent of Maryland is one of the most interesting of the whole fascinating group. She was America's first successful business woman, acting as executrix for Governor Leonard Calvert, and was practically America's first woman governor; in fact, though not in name. She prevented a mutiny among the unpaid Maryland soldiers, and received the support of the Assembly against the irate proprietor, Lord Baltimore, who had not

been consulted concerning a woman's appointment as his attorney.

She was also probably the first woman in this country to seek the vote, for in 1648 Mistress Brent asked "a vote in the House for herself and vocye also," but was denied.

Other chapters sketch quickly and skillfully the stories of Anne Hutchinson and of Mary Dyer, both of Massachusetts, who fought for the religious freedom they had hoped to gain by coming to this new country. Anne Hutchinson was exiled and Mary Dyer was hanged for her temerity in discussing religious questions. There are chapters devoted to Mary Lyon, who revolutionized woman's education and founded Mt. Holyoke College; Dorothea Lynde Dix, who exposed the miseries of the jails and had asylums built for the insane; Anne Pamela Cunningham, an invalid who saved Mount Vernon for the nation, and Eliza Lucas Pinckney, who introduced indigo, which became a great and profitable product into the colonies. A curious omission is the lack of adequate attention paid Lucretia Mott and Lucy Stone.

It is startling to realize—and Mrs. McCallum's book makes one realize—the length and bitterness of woman's fight for the rights and freedom always possessed by men. The women of before the Revolution wanted what women have always wanted, what women have only recently gained and are still fighting for; and it has taken these hundreds of years to prove the justice and plausibility of those ancient dreams and hopes of the frightened but brave women pioneers and adventurers.

One understands, too, after reading this

book, just how tragically the Civil War hindered woman's progress, coming as it did at the time when so many of woman's plans were maturing.

Women Aviators Advance

WOMEN continue to make and break records in the air, and to hold positions in aviation once thought of as purely masculine.

Gene Du Rand, 20 years old, of St. Petersburg, Florida, recently made her 750th parachute jump from the wings of a plane. This is one record for women, and she holds two others. She has made the highest parachute jump, 18,700 feet, and the lowest, 150 feet, ever attempted by women.

Zora Koritnik is St. Louis's first woman air traffic representative, after only a year's association with the aviation industry. She has finished a pilot's ground course and plans to fly someday soon. Miss Koritnik is a graduate of the University of Missouri.

Blanche Wilcox Noyes of Cleveland has accomplished a great deal in her less than a year of flying. She finished fourth in the recent women's transcontinental air derby from Los Angeles to Cleveland, and now she is the twelfth woman in America to pass the difficult examination for a transport pilot's license. In the transport rating tests she executed spins, power spirals, and righted a plane from dangerous stalls. Mrs. Noyes is the first Ohio woman transport pilot.

Married Women Doctors Barred

THE Birmingham (England) General Hospital has recently decided that in the future married women shall not be

Mrs. McCallum is somewhat of a pioneer herself, being the Secretary of State of Texas, and the discoverer of her State's long-lost Declaration of Independence.

Feminist Notes

eligible for appointment on the staff and women now on the staff must resign on marriage.

A young married woman doctor had received four months' leave of absence, during which her baby was born. She returned to her duties, but the Board of Management considered the work of the hospital undesirably disorganized by this temporary retirement of a member of the staff and made the rule for the future.

Lady Barrett, dean of the London School of Medicine for Women; Dr. Jane Walker, and some of the other leading London medical women have spoken strongly against this as a "reactionary step."

Women and Good Government

THE hope that the interest taken in government by the women of the United States "will be more intelligent than the interest men have taken in it during the many years they had practically complete control" was voiced March 24 over the Columbia broadcasting system by Senator Arthur Capper of Kansas.

Senator Capper directed his hearers to "Women's Interest in Good Government." He said, "Our newspapers and magazines are written for the women, primarily. Political speeches are written and made for the women of the country, their's is the deciding vote in every election, and they are gradually getting equality of the pocketbook."

She is a member of Xi Chapter of Theta Sigma Phi, national honorary and professional journalistic fraternity, at the University of Texas.

"Economic equality cannot be granted by a constitutional amendment, but it is coming by slow degrees. I know some of the women believe it is coming too slowly, but at any rate it is coming."

The speaker explained the ever increasing interest women are taking in public affairs, and added, "every department of the Government, practically every law enacted by Congress, touches the welfare or the interest of women in this country as much as it does the men."

"True, women have home ties and home responsibilities. I hope they always will have. But I know a lot of men who would be better men and more worth while if they took over some of those home responsibilities."

Trade Advisor

LUCY GOLDSMITH SHORE of New York was appointed by the former Spanish Dictator, General Primo de Rivera, as a special trade advisor to Spain.

Mrs. Shore's duties consist of advising the Spanish Government and reporting on plans for developing Spain's export and import trade with the United States.

They Need the Money

NINE-TENTHS of married women seeking employment do so either because their husbands do not earn enough to support their families or they are divorced or separated, according to a survey made in Denver, Colorado, by the Women's Bureau, Department of Labor.

News from the Field

Tea at Alva Belmont House

ATEA in honor of Jessie Ackerman was given at Alva Belmont House, headquarters of the National Woman's Party, on April 9. Some thirty people attended and heard Miss Ackerman talk on the position of women in different countries she has visited. Miss Ackerman is a psychologist, traveler, college instructor, and magazine writer.

Tea for Emma Wold

THE Six Point Group of England gave a tea on March 10 in London in honor of Dr. Emma Wold, technical advisor to the United States delegation at the International Conference on the Codification of International Law. Elsie Ross Shields, translator for the delegation, was also present.

Dr. Ivy Williams was technical advisor to the British delegation; Dr. Marie

Luders, technical advisor to the German delegation; Mrs. Schonfield Polano, technical advisor to the Dutch delegation; and Dr. Kralova-Horakova, technical advisor to the Czechoslovakian delegation.

Ruth B. Shipley, one of the United States delegates, and Marcelle Renson, Belgian delegate, were the only women plenipotentiaries at the conference.

Indiana Chairman Is G. O. P. Head

MRS. OVID BUTLER JAMESON, recently appointed chairman of the Indiana State Branch of the National Woman's Party, has been named acting vice-chairman of the Republican County Committee of Marion County, Indiana. Mrs. Jameson is also president of the Indianapolis League of American Pen Women. Her father, her husband, her two sons, and her brother, Booth Tark-

ington, the author, have been members of the Indiana General Assembly. Mrs. Jameson succeeds Mrs. Arthur Robinson, wife of the junior Senator from Indiana, as head of the women's activities of the Republican county organization.

Addresses Students

ACLASS of some two hundred students of political science at the University of Maryland heard Mabel Vernon speak on Equal Rights on March 26. Miss Vernon spoke on Equal Rights in general and equality in nationality laws in particular.

DAY PRINTING COMPANY

PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS

600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.